

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 are now pending in the application. Claims 8-9 are new. The claim amendments are fully supported by the application as filed and do not introduce new subject matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, and 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acker (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0058641) in view of An (U.S. Pub. No. 20040040036). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants believe claim 1 is allowable over Acker in view of An because the claim and the prior art differ. The Office Action recognizes that "requesting the satellite receiver module to send the channel information table to the radio display module if the version of the channel information table stored in the satellite receiver module is different from a version stored in the radio display module" of claim 1 is not disclosed in Acker. The Office Action alleges, however, that this limitation is disclosed in page 1, section [0006] and page 2, sections [0026-0027] of An.

An, as best understood by the Applicant, merely discloses displaying different information for different receiving devices and a check for updated information. An does not disclose or suggest that a *request* is made to a satellite receiver to update a channel information table in a display if the version in the display is different from the version in the satellite receiver, as do the claims.

The memory of An does not make a requests in response to a comparison of versions of a channel information table. Instead, An merely seems to be checking information or automatically sending correct information, as is common in the art, rather than as a function of a request based on a comparison of table versions. Nowhere does An indicate that versions of tables are compared or that a request is made for an update based on this comparison.

For at least the reason that the prior art does not include elements of claim 1, it is therefore believed to be allowable. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least this reason.

#### **NEW CLAIMS**

Claims 8-9 are new and include elements of claims 1 and 3 and are believed to be allowable for at least this reason. No new matter has been added.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) ~ 944-6500.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 6, 2007

By: 

Gordon K. Harris, Jr.  
Reg. No. 28,615  
Attorney for Applicant

Ralph Edwin Smith  
CIMS 483-02-19  
DaimlerChrysler Intellectual Capital Corporation  
DaimlerChrysler Tech. Center  
800 Chrysler Drive  
Auburn Hills, Michigan 48326-2757  
Phone: 248-944-6519